

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ACER, INC., ACER AMERICA
CORPORATION and GATEWAY, INC.,

Case No. 5:08-cv-00877 PSG

Plaintiffs,

v.

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LTD.,
PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION,
ALLIACENSE LTD.,

Defendants.

HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC.,

Case No. 5:08-cv-00882 PSG

Plaintiffs,

v.

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LTD.,
PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION,
ALLIACENSE LTD.,

Defendants.


ORDER SETTING HEARING RE: SEALING MOTIONS

1 There lies amid the forest of important summary judgment motions pending in these cases a
2 thick and expanding underbrush of sealing motions.¹ After consuming the better part of yesterday
3 afternoon trying to clear this underbrush out, the court is left with the impression that the parties
4 may misunderstand a variety of basic sealing requirements set forth by our Local Rules and case
5 law. Basics such as narrowly tailored requests. Or requests being submitted by the party actually
6 claiming confidentiality. Properly designating documents as “confidential” in the first instance so
7 as to avoid unnecessary sealing requests. Or explaining how the request fits within *Kamakana's*
8 “compelling reason” standard for documents associated with dispositive motions. And so on and
9 so forth.
10

11 The court wishes to clear up this misunderstanding, without resort to yet another lengthy
12 written lament on the subject of sealing requests in patent cases.² To that end, when the parties
13 appear on Tuesday, August 13, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.,³ they should be prepared to justify each of the
14 sealing requests pending before the court.
15

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: August 7, 2013
18

19 
20 PAUL S. GREWAL
21 United States Magistrate Judge
22
23

24 ¹ See e.g., Case No. 5:08-cv-00977-PSG: Docket Nos. 456, 465, 474, and 487; Case No. 5:08-cv-00882-PSG: Docket Nos. 460, 465, 468, and 478.

25 ² See, e.g., *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.*, Case No. 11-CV-01846 LHK PSG, 2013
26 WL 412864 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 1, 2013); *Brocade Communications Systems, Inc. v. A10 Networks,*
27 *Inc.*, Case No. C 10-3428 PSG, 2013 WL 211115 C 10-3428 PSG (N.D. Cal. Jan 17, 2013);
28 *Dynetix Design Solutions Inc. v. Synopsys Inc.*, Case No. C 11-CV-05973 PSG, 2013 WL 1366046
(N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2013).

³ See Docket No. 444.